

**FILED**

**NOV 26 2007**

**NOT FOR PUBLICATION**  
**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS**  
**FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT**

**CATHY A. CATTERSON, CLERK**  
**U.S. COURT OF APPEALS**

GABRIEL VAZQUEZ; MARIA DEL  
SOCCORRO MERLOS BAUTISTA,

Petitioners,

v.

MICHAEL B. MUKASEY, Attorney  
General,

Respondent.

No. 06-72253

Agency Nos. A95-185-009  
A95-181-384

MEMORANDUM<sup>\*</sup>

On Petition for Review of an Order of the  
Board of Immigration Appeals

Submitted November 13, 2007<sup>\*\*</sup>

Before: TROTT, W. FLETCHER, and CALLAHAN, Circuit Judges.

---

<sup>\*</sup> This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent except as provided by 9th Cir. R. 36-3.

<sup>\*\*</sup> The panel unanimously finds this case suitable for decision without oral argument. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

Gabriel Vazquez and Maria Del Socorro Merlos Bautista, natives and citizens of Mexico, petition pro se for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' ("BIA") order denying their motion to reconsider. We have jurisdiction pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review for abuse of discretion the denial of a motion to reconsider, *Oh v. Gonzales*, 406 F.3d 611, 612 (9th Cir. 2005), and review de novo due process claims, *Ram v. INS*, 243 F.3d 510, 516 (9th Cir. 2001). We deny the petition for review.

The BIA did not violate petitioners' due process rights and was within its discretion in denying petitioners' motion to reconsider because the motion failed to identify any error of fact or law in the BIA's prior decision affirming the IJ's order denying cancellation of removal. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 1003.2(b)(1); *Socop-Gonzalez v. INS*, 272 F.3d 1176, 1180 n.2 (9th Cir. 2001) (en banc).

**PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.**